

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,748,580 to Matsui ("Matsui") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,069,867 to Ikegame ("Ikegame").

Claims 5 and 6 are allowed.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 1-7 are pending for consideration. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that each pair of wires includes a left wire and a right wire. Applicants understand from my conversation with Examiner Coleman today that this amendment will not raise any new issues.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of Ikegame. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims as amended.

The Office Action offers no reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would be prompted to combine Matsui and Ikegame. In fact, Matsui teaches the use of mounting wires, while Ikegame teaches the use of leaf springs for mounting a lens. The leaf springs of Ikegame only allow motion in the focusing direction Z, while the mounting wires of Matsui allow focusing and tracking movement. (Matsui at col. 8, lines 54-55 and col. 9, line 17.)

Thus, Applicants assert that one skilled in the art would combine Matsui and Ikegame because they describe very different means of supporting a lens.

The Office Action states that Ikegame discloses “the use of resilient supporting members of the same length and material, that are parallel to each other and attached to the supporting means at different distances ... .” However, Ikegame does not disclose or suggest leaf springs 6 and 7 as being the same length as recited in claims 1, 2, 6, and 7, and in Fig. 12 of Ikegame the leaf springs (rather than the wires recited in the claims) appear to be different lengths.

While the leaf springs of Ikegame are not disclosed as having the same length, they are disclosed as being attached to the supporting means at the same distance rather than the different distance recited (for the wires rather than leaf springs) in claims 1, 2, 6, and 7. Col. 10, lines 5 and 6 of Ikegame state that the “[e]ffective lengths  $l_a$  and  $l_b$  of the leaf springs 6 and 7 are equal to each other ... .” As shown in Fig. 12 of Ikegame,  $l_a$  and  $l_b$  are the distances from the attachments to the stationary (supporting) member 8 to the attachments to the holding member 2.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 1, independent claim 2 and its dependent claims 3-4, and independent claim 7 are in condition for allowance. Allowance of claims 1-4, 6, and 7 is earnestly solicited.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: August 27, 2007

By:   
Kent Basson  
Registration No. 48,125

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
202.739.3000